UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Before The Honorable YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS, Judge

EPIC GAMES, INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

NO. C 20-05640 YGR

APPLE, INC.,

Defendant.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF ZOOM WEBINAR PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES VIA ZOOM WEBINAR:

For Plaintiff: Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP

825 Eighth Avenue

New York, New York 10019

BY: GARY A. BORNSTEIN,

YONATAN EVEN, ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Wednesday, June 5, 2024

For Defendant: Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP

2001 M Street NW, Suite 600

Washington, D.C. 20036

BY: MARK A. PERRY, ATTORNEY AT LAW

(Appearances continued next page)

Reported By: Raynee H. Mercado, CSR No. 8258

Proceedings reported by electronic/mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

1	APPEARANCES (CONT'D.)
2	
3	For Defendant: Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
4	One Embarcadero Center, Suite 2600 San Francisco, California 94111-3715
5	BY: DANA L. CRAIG, ATTORNEY AT LAW
6	
7	
8	000
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
Wednesday, June 5, 2024
 1
                                                            8:28 a.m.
 2
                          PROCEEDINGS
 3
                               (Zoom Webinar)
                                  --000--
 4
 5
 6
               THE CLERK: Morning, everyone.
 7
          These proceedings are being court reported by this court.
      Any other recording of this proceeding either by video, audio,
 8
 9
      including screen shots or other copying of the hearing is
10
      strictly prohibited.
11
          Your Honor, now calling the civil matter 20-CV-5640, Epic
12
      Games versus Apple, Incorporated.
13
          Parties, please state your appearances for the record
14
      starting with plaintiff.
15
               MR. BORNSTEIN: Good morning, Your Honor. Gary
16
      Bornstein for Epic. I have on with me Yonatan Even. And with
17
      the court's permission, Mr. Even will be leading the
18
      discussions for us today.
19
               THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Good morning.
20
               MR. EVEN: Morning, Your Honor.
21
               MR. PERRY: Good morning, Your Honor. Mark Perry for
22
              And I have with me today Dana Craig of Gibson Dunn,
23
      who's one of our e-discovery experts.
24
                THE COURT: Okay. Good morning.
25
          So where -- where are we? Who wants to start?
```

MR. PERRY: I'm happy to start, Your Honor. 1 2 Mark Perry. 3 We met and conferred with Cravath on -- or with Epic --4 excuse me -- on Monday. And we've had some follow-up emails. 5 Here's the basic outline as I understand it. The parties 6 have agreed on a two-step process for this document 7 production. The first is Apple's delivery of what we're calling some "go-gets," some follow-up materials from the 8 9 Mr. Oliver production that was made last week. And that is 10 under way. 11 Second step would be a custodial search of records related to the link entitlement. We have provided Epic with a 12 13 proposed list of custodians, seventeen people, which is 14 basically the working group that the Court has heard about 15 during the evidentiary hearing and the executives that 16 reviewed and approved the entitlement. 17 Just by contrast, that compares to 24 custodians at the 18 merits stage of the -- of the case, so it's, you know, roughly 19 the same number -- not quite, but a large number. 20 We have done a -- we don't have all of their documents 21 pulled. We have access right now to a subset of them. 22 have run a -- a test search string -- again, the parties 23 haven't agreed on search terms, but we just wanted to size the 24 box, if you will, and that set will result in at least a

hundred thousand documents, probably more. But we need to

25

settle, obviously, on search terms before that can be actually run for real.

I think the next steps are for the parties to agree on the custodians and the search terms and actually get the search under way.

We continue to think -- our estimate last week was three months to do this production. I think that's still a fair estimate assuming we're in the ballpark that our test work over the weekend has done. And we would -- we had proposed to Epic that we follow the ESI protocols and other guidance that was used essentially during the merits document productions as to confidentiality, privilege logs, and so forth. I mean, there's -- there's a set of procedures in place that we don't think needs to be changed.

THE COURT: Mr. Even?

MR. EVEN: Thank you, Your Honor.

So, unfortunately, I'm going to have to disagree with what was just said. I think the only thing we agree with is that we had discussed and agreed to a two-step -- a two-step discovery process.

What we asked for and what we thought we had an agreement on is that in the first step, Apple will produce in relatively short order -- and when we spoke, they said maybe last -- maybe next week. They will produce on a go-get basis the relevant Quip database that was, as we understand it, used to

run Apple's injunction-related decision-making. That was the -- the repository for this project.

That production, we then wrote to Apple, needs to include all the draft versions and revisions. Apple told us that, yes, Quip does -- they did have the setting such that revisions, et cetera, are being kept.

And what we had expected was that all that is going to be something that we get, we can review, sink our teeth into, understand who against who, and then discuss custodians for the next step.

What we learned last night from an email from Mr. Perry is that Apple's view is that they're only going to produce to us the documents that were specifically linked to Quip in the few emails that we've highlighted last week from Mr. Carson's production.

That's not too many documents. That's a handful of documents, I believe. There's a lot of writing about how they're setting up Quip for the project, et cetera. But the documents themselves, they're -- they're a handful of documents. That's not what we need. That's not what we asked for. That's not what we understand the orders are.

And then what we also learned last night is that Apple is now saying that Quip and another repository, a Box repository that we've found additional emails suggesting that Apple also had that, that Apple will only collect those documents as part

Case 4:20-cv-05640-YGR Document 982 Filed 06/05/24 Page 7 of 16 7

of its custodial review, meaning however many custodians they had -- apparently some personal Box and Quip issues -- Apple intends to apply search terms to that, et cetera.

That is not what we had in mind at all. That's not what we think we need.

Apple clearly has repositories that were dedicated to this particular project. We need Apple to get those repositories, not through custodial searches, not to apply search terms or anything like that. These are repositories for this project.

particular project. We need Apple to get those repositories, not through custodial searches, not to apply search terms or anything like that. These are repositories for this project. Review it for privilege, if that's what they need to do, but, otherwise, take the databases as they exist and put them on a hard drive and ship them to us. That's what we think we need as a first step. Then we can intelligently sit down and discuss who all we need as custodians.

But we need some background for that, not a background through the narrow prism of the Carson/Oliver production or from three or four or five or six documents that happened to be sent as links in that production.

THE COURT: What kind of documents does the repository have, Mr. Perry?

MR. PERRY: So, Your Honor, I think "repository" is -- is a misnomer. It's not a database or a repository. It is a program. It's a -- it's a functionality, if you will, that allows the team to -- to create collaborative materials.

It is accessed through the custodians. It's -- in other

words, it's not like a central thing. It is -- it is accessed through the custodians. So Mr. Oliver, who was, as the Court is aware, deeply involved in this has access to various files and folders regarding -- there are in there we know right now, meeting notes, agendas, other materials relating to the project, all of which we are pulling, all of which we are going to deliver.

Again, this is -- this is the way that the -- the program works is through the custodians. We have the links from Mr. Oliver. It -- there is not a -- my understanding -- we're learning this as we go on Quip, but we do have Quip specialists within the company. There's not a way to search Quip itself. You have to go in through the links maintained by the custodians, so the more custodians the more links we have.

The documents are maintained and retained. We will -- we will get them. We believe from our initial review -- and, again, the collection is under way -- that the Mr. Oliver-linked Quip files will be a significant number relating to this project, as we've explained to Mr. Even previously.

THE COURT: Mr. Perry?

MR. PERRY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What is the analogy? That is, we all

have folders. I've got, you know, I have a folder that I use

```
1
       for everything in this case. Now, my law clerks may have
 2
      their own folders, but we have a central file for this case.
 3
      Anything that's related to it goes into that folder. Anybody
      has access to it if they're authorized to be in that folder.
 4
 5
          Isn't there the same kind of thing for the project? Can't
      you just download the folder for this project?
 6
 7
               MR. PERRY: There is -- the answer is yes and no,
 8
      Your Honor. And if I can explain.
 9
          There is a folder for this -- there is more than one
      folder for the project that Mr. Oliver had access to and that
10
11
      others did as well in exactly the way the Court described.
12
                        (Pause in the proceedings.)
13
               THE COURT: Is it just me or did Mr. Perry freeze?
14
               THE CERTIFIED STENOGRAPHIC COURT REPORTER: Mr. Perry
15
      froze, Your Honor.
16
                THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Craig, can you let him know
      that he --
17
18
               MS. CRAIG: He looks to be back.
19
               THE COURT: All right.
20
               MR. PERRY: I apologize, Your Honor. I'm in a -- in
      a hotel with -- I don't have control over the Wi-Fi.
21
22
          There's not a master folder. There are folders within the
23
      Mr. Oliver production. And as I said, these other custodians,
24
      we will -- we will see what they have. So to the Court's
25
      analogy, Mr. Oliver has a file to which other members of the
```

working group had access. We are producing that.

Other members of the working group may or may not have their own files, and we will have to -- that's why we have to go on a custodian level rather than a top-down level.

We certainly believe as to Mr. Even's point, and we have explained this before, that the files to which Mr. Oliver had access will be a substantial start -- you know, a substantial amount of the Quip materials to which the full team had access because, as, you know, one of the team leaders, he would have presumably had access to the important materials there.

MR. EVEN: So, Your Honor, I -- I disagree with that as well, I'm afraid.

So we have documents, including documents that I placed in a binder before Your Honor on Friday. And what Mr. Guebert, for instance, writes in Apple dash EG10675385, "Hi all, meeting notes from today's discussion have been captured in Quip and are part of our folder that we will be using for this project," and a Quip link. "The folder also contains a work in progress functional spec," another link, "and tracking sheets for all our action items opens [sic]," another link. "We've looked at the Quip notes and web pages. Under governance of Quip, the first thing it says is that this system is built for e-discovery." And it says, "E-discovery apps pull messages and files from Quip and store the information in third data -- in third-party data warehouses.

From the data warehouses, documents, files, and messages can be searched, archived, or retrieved."

It's a Salesforce platform. It's clearly built with U.S.-style discovery in mind. It just can't be that we now need to ignore the fact that Apple managed this thing through a dedicated platform and wait for custodians who may or may not have access to specific documents and -- and run search terms that will, by definition, omit some of these documents because we don't know what we don't know about the -- the relevant search terms.

MR. PERRY: Your Honor, I think there's a
miscommunication here. I -- I'm sorry.

All of the things that Mr. Even just mentioned will be produced we hope next week. We are collecting these right now, so the meeting file -- the meeting notes folder, yes. It exists. We're pulling it down. My --

The point is we will get it, and when we produce it, this conversation will be much more useful when we both have -- both parties have, you know, what we can get out of Quip.

This is not, you know -- it is a tool that was used. We are pulling the information, and we have, you know, agreed to deliver it. I'm not sure how much further we can go in the abstract without seeing --

Everything Mr. Even just mentioned, we will deliver. I mean, that's not -- that's not in question.

```
1
           The issue is whether there is more. And the answer is
 2
      probably, but we will only know that by tracking through in
 3
      the usual discovery way the additional bread crumbs. And if
 4
      we -- you know, if there is a, quote, unquote, master folder
 5
      that we can identify, we will produce that, too.
 6
          This is -- this is a matter of how the data structure is
 7
      organized in the machine, not -- not a matter of --
 8
          Well, that's the issue.
 9
               THE COURT: All right.
10
          Why -- so there is going to be a production next week,
11
      right?
12
               MR. PERRY: Yes, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: And when do you expect that production to
13
14
      occur?
               MR. PERRY: Your -- Your Honor, we are collecting the
15
16
      materials today. I can say next week for sure. I don't know
17
      what day because we are still pulling it down and trying to
18
      get everything in one place, so --
19
          Ms. Craig, I don't know if we have a better estimate on
20
      time.
               MS. CRAIG: I think we can do it middle of next week.
21
22
               THE COURT: So, Mr. Even, sounds to me like maybe we
23
      talk again after you get this production.
               MR. EVEN: So I'm obviously willing to do that, and
24
25
       I -- and I appreciate that the Court's time on that, and that
```

would be helpful.

I can only live off of what Apple told us in emails, obviously. But I hear what Mr. Perry's saying, and I'm happy to see that production and understand it.

I would just comment that, you know, both we and -- and Apple have done many productions like these in the past. I don't know what that means "if there is a central folder," like, I would have -- I would have expected by now Apple to know exactly what the central folders are.

There are 60 people who had access to this Quip thing that we counted or thereabouts. Apple should go and interview them and ask them, "where's the central repository," and pull these repositories, not through custodial reviews.

The whole notion of pulling anything from central repository through custodial reviews seems to me completely contrary to, a, what the Court ordered and, b, frankly common sense.

THE COURT: Yeah, I don't know that I disagree with you. And -- but I also am not in the nitty-gritty.

If there are folders, the whole folder should be produced.

I mean, it's -- I don't -- in that way, it's very -- it seems to me to be very simple.

You have central repositories. Lots of people have access. The whole thing just gets produced. So -- and then if there's follow-up -- you know, there may need to be

```
1
       follow-up. I don't know.
 2
          When I -- I said "all," and so they're obviously taking
 3
       "all" seriously, you know. But I think until we get -- I
 4
      mean, and if that's also the case, it would seem to me that
 5
      the production should be pretty large because it should all be
 6
      there, one would think. I don't know. We'll see.
 7
          But I think it would be better to have a discussion that's
 8
      not in a vacuum.
 9
               MR. EVEN: Understood.
10
               THE COURT: So I can meet on Friday afternoon,
11
       assuming I don't have plane delays. Or I can meet the
12
       following Monday on the 17th.
13
          So -- and we don't exactly know when it is, so do you just
14
      want to schedule the 17th?
15
               MR. PERRY: That would be good for Apple, Your Honor.
16
      And we could certainly provide an update to the -- the clerk
17
      or the Court if that would be helpful.
18
               MR. EVEN: That -- we can make it work, Your Honor.
       If -- if the court's calendar allows for it to be late in the
19
20
       day Pacific, that'd be better for me 'cause I'm in a
21
       deposition that day. But if not, somebody else could cover.
22
               THE COURT: On the 17th?
23
               MR. EVEN: Yes, Your Honor.
24
               THE COURT: Yeah, I'm -- my trial got pushed back by
25
       a week, so I'm free that day. So what time works for you,
```

```
1
       then?
 2
               MR. EVEN: 4:00 p.m. Pacific if Your Honor can do
 3
      that, that'd be ideal for me. I'll be out of the deposition
 4
      by then.
 5
                THE COURT: Does that work for everybody?
               MR. PERRY: It's fine with Apple, Your Honor.
 6
                                                               Thank
 7
      you very much.
 8
                THE COURT: All right. So then we'll set another
 9
      conference for 4:00 p.m. June 17th, same link.
10
          Hopefully, we'll have a much clearer idea of where we're
11
      going on this. Okay?
12
               MR. EVEN: Your Honor, may I make one more request
13
      before we leave?
14
                THE COURT: Sure.
15
               MR. EVEN: Apologize in advance.
16
          But we also still have not received a revised production
17
      of Mr. Oliver's documents that removes any redactions for
18
      confidentiality. I understand we're waiting on the priv log
19
       for that -- those redactions, but -- and I understand it's
20
      coming but. For the confidentiality, redactions should just
21
      be removed.
22
                THE COURT: I'd agree with that. They need to be
23
      produced next week with the rest of the production, or no
24
      later than --
25
```

MR. PERRY: Yes, Your Honor.

```
1
                THE COURT:
                            -- next week.
 2
                MR. PERRY: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
                THE COURT: All right?
 4
           Anything else?
 5
                MR. EVEN: Nothing from me. Thank you, Your Honor.
 6
                MR. PERRY: Not from Apple, Your Honor. Thank you
 7
      very much.
 8
                THE COURT: All right. We'll see you in about a
 9
      week.
10
           Thank you.
11
                MR. BORNSTEIN: Thank you.
12
                MR. EVEN: Thank you.
13
                 (Proceedings were concluded at 8:47 A.M.)
14
                                  --000--
15
                          CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
16
                I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
17
       from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
18
       I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related to,
19
      nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this
20
      hearing was taken, and further that I am not financially nor
21
      otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.
22
23
24
               Raynee H. Mercado, CSR, RMR, CRR, FCRR, CCRR
25
                          Wednesday, June 5, 2024
```